Mapping One Health studies and practices that integrate the human, animal and environmental health dimensions: A scoping review protocol

Short: Mapping One Health integrated studies and practices: A scoping review protocol

Authors: Jessica Farias Dantas Medeiros[1], Jorge Otávio Maia Barreto[2], Sindy Maciel Silva[3], Johnathan Portela da Silva Galdino[1], Christina Pacheco[4], Eveline Fernandes Nascimento Vale[1], Juliana Michelotti Fleck[5], Kary Desiree Santos Mercedes[1], Karine Suene Mendes Almeida[6], Mayara Suelirta da Costa[1], Verônica Cortez Ginani[1], Wildo Navegantes de Araújo[1], Leonor Maria Pacheco Santos[1,*]

1.Programa de Pós-Graduação em Saúde Coletiva Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, Brazil
2.Escola de Governo Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Brasília, Brazil
3.Instituto de Higiene e Medicina Tropical, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal
4.Departamento de Biologia Celular e Molecular, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil
5.Fundação de Apoio à Fiocruz, Fiotec, Brasília, Brazil
6.Programa de Pós-Graduação em Medicina Tropical, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, Brazil
*Corresponding author

Abstract

The growing interconnection between human, animal, and environmental health has escalated the need for integrated approaches to public health. The One Health framework addresses this necessity by promoting local, national, and global interdisciplinary collaboration. Population growth, intensive animal farming, and manmade environmental changes contribute to the emergence and spread of infectious diseases of probable animal origin, such as COVID-19. Establishing the Quadripartite collaboration with four multilateral United Nations' agencies underscores the increasing recognition of these interdependencies. This scoping review protocol aims to evaluate how One Health studies integrate human, animal, and environmental health, analyzing methodologies, scope, and interdisciplinary collaboration, to identify key achievements, existing gaps, and future research priorities. The projected literature search will include PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, Virtual Health Library, Health Systems Evidence, and Social Systems Evidence. Additionally, grey literature will be retrieved from Opengrey, Thesis Commons, and

Open Access Theses and Dissertations, by structured electronic search, as well as the first 100 entries in Google Scholar, manually. This protocol proposes to include studies, policies, regulations, strategies, and interventions published from 2004 onwards aimed at the prevention and integrated management of food safety, zoonotic diseases, antimicrobial resistance, and the impacts of climate change on health. No language filters will be applied. Two independent reviewers will analyze titles, abstracts, and full texts to conduct a two-phase review, with a third reviewer resolving disagreements. Data will be retrieved using a standardized data extraction form, and results will be presented in graphic and tabular format, accompanied by a narrative summary, to highlight the achievements of integrated One Health implementation. The expected result is the development of a scoping review protocol to map One Health studies and practices, which effectively integrate the human, animal, and environmental health dimensions applicable globally in public health scenarios.

Keywords: One Health; Food Safety; Zoonotic Diseases; Antimicrobial resistance, Climate Change; Environment and Public Health; Scoping Review; Protocol.

Background

Due to the combination of human population growth, the rapid expansion of intensive animal farming, notably poultry and cattle at high stocking density, often in unnatural conditions, and the profound human interventions in the environment, the world is witnessing intense effects on the evolution of diseases in all species. Rapid global interconnections mean that uncontrolled infectious diseases in one part of the world can quickly threaten health across species anywhere. The recent COVID-19 pandemic clearly showed that the local emergence of a lethal pathogen of probable animal origin affected public health worldwide (1).

One Health is an integrative, cooperative, and transdisciplinary approach to health promotion and surveillance at the local, national, and global levels. It aims to improve health conditions and recognizes the interconnection and interdependence between humans, animals, and the environment (2,3).

In 2010, three UN agencies, the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Organization for Animal Health (WOAH), and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), launched a strategy for partnership (known as Tripartite Concept Note) recognizing a shared responsibility in addressing health risks at the human-animal (wildlife and domestic) – environment interface (2). A deteriorated global climate crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic has spurred the formal inclusion of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) into this effort in March 2022. From then on, the newly formed Quadripartite grouping of international agencies receives scientific support from an independent One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP) (4). Indeed, there is evidence of a growing number of One Health Networks to tackle the human-animal-environment interface, created from 2013 to 2023, compared to the preceding decade. However, investments were not equitably distributed: most initiatives were formed in Europe to the detriment of other regions, and emerging infections and novel pathogens were the priority focus area (5).

The idea that the environment affects human health has existed for a long time. Hippocrates already stated that biological and environmental conditions affect human health; later Aristotle attempted to elucidate similarities between human and animal vital systems (6). By 1877, Hayes, a medical doctor especially concerned about food safety and quality, developed the dual concept of One Health - One Disease (7). In the 19th century, Robert Virchow coined the term “zoonosis” to describe diseases transmitted from animals to humans. Despite this recognition, it was only in the 1970s that

82 epidemiologist Calvin Schwabe proposed the "One Medicine" theory to study the
83 connections between humans and animals in nutrition, habitat, and health aspects, stating
84 that both human and veterinary medicine have similar scope in physiology, anatomy, and
85 pathology (2,6,8).
86 Handling public and animal health threats effectively and efficiently requires effort and
87 adequate planning. Additionally, it should involve the public and private health sectors.
88 A systematic review of One Health intersectoral collaboration governance mechanisms
89 disclosed fragmented governance structures, capacity gaps, funding constraints,
90 inadequate data sharing, and stakeholder conflicts (9). It remains a challenge within the
91 One Health strategy to date, especially for developing countries (10). The One Health
92 concept still requires more recognition by health professionals, notably medical doctors
93 and government stakeholders in many countries. On the other hand, we are witnessing
94 Health Surveillance public policies allowing the gradual insertion of One Health
95 supportive efforts in health practices, even if there is scarce integration between their
96 organizations.
97 Integration is clearly the core concept regarding One Health policy implementation. Therefore,
98 more studies are needed to thoroughly map existing research addressing this integration
99 in local and global contexts. Given the evolving nature of One Health research, a scoping
100 review provides a comprehensive means to identify the landscape of studies, policies, and
101 interventions related to its implementation. This valuable methodology will help identify
102 trends, knowledge gaps, and the extent of the available literature that integrates the main
103 One Health dimensions (2,3,11).
104 An exploratory search across databases, including PubMed, Web of Science,
105 PROSPERO, and Open Science (OSF) revealed a lack of systematic reviews specifically
106 evaluating the One Health framework's effectiveness in fostering interdisciplinary

collaboration. While previous reviews have examined isolated aspects, such as zoonotic disease control and antimicrobial resistance, few have attempted to synthesize a holistic perspective on its implementation.

Recent global health developments – such as formalizing the Quadripartite collaboration (WHO, WOAH, FAO, and UNEP) – warrant a fresh examination of the One Health framework's role in shaping integrated policies and interventions. This scoping review protocol aims to evaluate how One Health studies integrate human, animal, and environmental health, analyzing methodologies, scope, and interdisciplinary collaboration to identify key achievements, existing gaps, and future research priorities. By leveraging updated literature search and diverse data sources, this review will provide insights into One Health's successes, limitations as far as interdisciplinary collaboration, and areas for future research, ultimately contributing to more effective health strategies on a global scale (4).

Research Question and Acronym

The acronym PCC, which stands for "Participants", "Concept", and "Context" (12), was adopted to structure the research question for the scoping review (Table 1).

Table 1. Acronym for the Scoping Review Protocol	
Participants	This Scoping Review will include publications on studies, policies, regulations, and interventions aimed at preventing and integrating management of food safety, zoonotic diseases, antimicrobial resistance, environmental health, and the impacts of climate change on health.
Concept	One Health approach in formulating, implementing, and integrating policies and practices.
Context	Global, as the protocol will not be limited to publications from any specific region.

Source: Prepared by the authors

Research question

How have One Health studies integrated human, animal, and environmental health, and what do their methodologies, scope, and interdisciplinary collaboration reveal about key achievements, gaps, and future research priorities?

Methods

Framework

This scoping review will follow the methodological framework developed by the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) (12) and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist (13). The methodological elements or characteristics found in evidence synthesis reviews, as selected from the reporting guideline PRISMA-ScR, such as elements relating to the search, selection, data extraction, and risk of bias steps of the review process, as well as other elements of quality, such as number of authors, and involvement of different specialists, such as librarians will be considered.

Eligibility Criteria

Original articles, formally established references, and publications presenting studies, strategies, experiences, and actions on the One Health approach conducted from January 2004 onwards will be included. The protocol suggests the inclusion of grey literature: dissertations and theses, governmental and non-governmental organizations reports, policy documents, and other relevant sources to ensure a comprehensive view of the practices and strategies adopted. Letters to the editor, congress abstracts, event annals, sponsored articles, incomplete articles, articles without results, or articles outside this review's topic of interest will be excluded. An additional manual search will be performed in the references of included and excluded publications.

150 **Information and Evidence Sources**

151 The protocol proposes, as sources of evidence, the following scientific literature
152 databases: Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE) via
153 PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/), Latin American and Caribbean Literature in
154 Health Sciences (LILACS) via Virtual Health Library (BVS) (https://bvsalud.org), Health
155 Systems Evidence (https://www.healthsystemsevidence.org/), Social Systems Evidence
156 (https://www.socialsystemsevidence.org/), SciVerse Scopus (https://www.elsevier.com/
157 products/scopus/search), Web of Science (https://clarivate.com/academia-government/
158 scientific-and-academic-research/research-discovery-and-referencing/web-of-science/).
159 The Protocol recommends retrieving grey literature by structured electronic search in
160 Opengrey (https://opengrey.eu), Thesis Commons (https://thesiscommons.org/), and
161 Open Access Theses and Dissertations (https://oatd.org/). Search in Google Scholar
162 (https://scholar.google.com) will be performed manually by scanning the first 100 entries
163 in "Incognito mode" to avoid being influenced by the researcher's browsing history. The
164 reference lists of the most relevant studies will be subject to manual search.

165 **Search Strategy**

166 The terms, keywords, and synonyms relevant to the topic in the Medical Subject Headings
167 (MeSH) should be used to construct the search strategy applicable to each corresponding
168 database. Regarding PubMed, the search strategy included the MeSH terms as shown
169 below (Table 2). The protocol recommends filtering studies published from January 2004
170 onwards without language restriction. Adaptations of this search strategy will be proposed
171 for each database.

172

173

Table 2. Search Strategy for the Scoping Review Protocol applicable to PubMed
("One Health" OR "One Medicine initiative") AND ("Food safety" OR "Food quality" OR "Food contamination" OR Zoonoses OR Zoonosis OR Zoonotic diseases" OR "Zoonotic Spillover" OR "Zoonotic Spillovers" OR "Microbial drug resistance" OR "Microbial antibiotic resistance" OR "Environmental health" OR "Environment and Public Health" OR "Climate Change").

Source: Prepared by the authors

On March 13, 2025, a pilot exploratory search in PubMed using the abovementioned strategy yielded 3,650 results published since January 2004.

Data Chart Process and Data Items

The studies identified from all the proposed databases will be fed into Mendeley and the Rayyan QCRI software to remove duplicates. Afterward, the remaining studies will be evaluated and selected based on the eligibility criteria by two independent reviewers (reviewer 1; reviewer 2), following the double-masked methodology when reading the title and summary of the studies in the first phase. In case of disagreements, a third reviewer (master) will be consulted for discussion and final decision. In the second stage, the full text of the selected studies will be read, and those excluded will be justified according to previously established exclusion criteria. Grey literature will be manually included in Mendeley software to manage selected evidence to be cited in the manuscript.

Extraction and synthesis of Results

A data extraction tool was adapted from the model provided by JBI (Table 3). The tool will include detailed information about the studies, such as title, authors, year of publication, source, country, publication type, and language. Additionally, data will be collected on the study's objective, the One Health approach addressed, and

methodological characteristics, such as the methodology used, data collection methods, databases consulted, and data collection period.

A few articles will be selected to test the tool, ensuring its effectiveness and reproducibility. Any necessary adjustments during the pilot testing will be made and adequately documented. Table 3 provides a complete description of the data extraction form (12).

The extracted data will be analyzed and summarized to meet the research objectives and organized into tables, charts, and narrative summaries. The analysis will be based on a narrative synthesis, highlighting the main findings, uncertainties, the evidence's applicability, strengths, limitations, and implications for managers and future research. The PRISMA-ScR guideline and the PRISMA Flow Diagram will structure and organize the review (11).

Expected Outcomes

When applied, the scoping review protocol will be instrumental in revealing several strategies implemented worldwide under the One Health approach, highlighting significant advances in managing food safety, zoonotic diseases, antimicrobial resistance, and environment and public health. As a result, challenges related to intersectoral integration and adapting applied policies to local realities may be identified, indicating areas where improvements and new research are needed. We expect to provide a comprehensive understanding of the implementation of the One Health strategy, highlighting both the advances and challenges faced, and to identify practices and areas that require improvement, contributing to research development, public policies, and the integration of human, animal and environmental health dimensions.

217
218

Table 3. Scoping review mapping of integrated One Health studies and practices data extraction form	
1. Publication Identification	
Article title	Full title of the article or document analyzed
Authors	Name of study authors
Year of publication	Year the study was published
Source	Title of the scientific journal or conference
Country of publication	Country
DOI	DOI number
Publication Type	Original article, dissertation, thesis, technical report, and the like.
Language	In which was it published
2. Publication's Objective	
Main objective	Describe the publications' main objective
Does the publication address the One Health approach explicitly?	Yes/No
Does the publication address the One Health strategies' implementation?	Yes/No
3. Methodological Characteristics	
Methodology employed	Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods
Methods used	Bibliometric analyses, systematic review, cross-sectional study
Data collection	Primary or secondary
Databases employed	Describe the databases employed
Data collection period	Describe the data collection period
4. One Health Dimensions	
The publication addresses (annotate one or more) ( ) Food safety/ Food quality/ Food contamination ( ) Zoonoses/ Zoonosis/ Zoonotic diseases/ Zoonotic Spillover/ Zoonotic Spillovers ( ) Microbial drug resistance/ Microbial antibiotic resistance ( ) Environmental Health/ Environment and Public Health/ Climate Change	
5. Main Results	
Are One Health publications integrated?	Yes/No
Are advances and challenges cited? If "Yes", describe below	Yes/No
Advances:	
Challenges:	
Public policies or recommendations?	Yes/No
6. Conclusions	
Are there conclusions? Cite below:	Yes/No
Main conclusions:	
Were knowledge gaps identified? Cite below:	Yes/No
Main Gaps:	
Are future studies suggested? Cite below:	Yes/No
Future studies:	
7. Additional Information	
Study funding (if applicable):	
Institutions involved	Authors affiliation/ Other institutions cited
Additional observations:	

219 **Source**: Prepared by the authors

Furthermore, the results of the protocol utilization aim to contribute to formulating future strategies, promoting a more holistic and coordinated approach, improving food safety, tackling zoonotic diseases, combating antimicrobial resistance, and mitigating the impacts of climate change on health. This study also serves as a basis for new research and fosters intersectoral collaboration, essential for the effectiveness of One Health initiatives globally.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the collaborators who contributed technical support to the construction of this protocol. We recognize the crucial role of professors in the Translational Research in Public Health discipline, who provided valuable insights and discussions during construction.

Financing (Funding)

None

Declarations

The authors declare that no conflicts of interest are associated with this study. This work seeks to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion in research, reflecting the authors' commitment to addressing critical public health issues.

Author Contribution

Conceptualization: JFDM, JOMB, JPSG, EFNV, LMPS, WNA;

Supervision JFDM, JOMB, JPSG, LMPS, WNA;

Methodology: JFDM, SMS, CP, KDMS, MSC;

Writing the original draft: JPSG, JFDM, EFNV, JMF, KDMS, KSMA, CP;

Writing Review & editing: LPMS; JFDM, SMS, JOMB, JPSG, VCG, WNA, CP, MSC;

All authors reviewed and approved the final version of this manuscript.

References

1. Zinsstag J, Kaiser-Grolimund A, Heitz-Tokpa K, Sreedharan R, Lubroth J, Caya F, et al. Advancing One human–animal–environment Health for global health security: what does the evidence say? The Lancet. 2023 Feb;401(10376):591–604.
2. Espeschit I de F, Santana CM, Moreira MAS. Public Policies and One Health in Brazil: The Challenge of the Disarticulation. Front Public Health. 2021 Jun 4;9.
3. Pitt SJ, Gunn A. The One Health Concept. Br J Biomed Sci. 2024 February 15;81.
4. World Health Organization (WHO). https://www.who.int/teams/one-health-initiative/quadripartite-secretariat-for-one-. 2025. Quadripartite Secretariat for One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP) .
5. Mwatondo A, Rahman-Shepherd A, Hollmann L, Chiossi S, Maina J, Kurup KK, et al. A global analysis of One Health Networks and the proliferation of One Health collaborations. The Lancet. 2023 Feb;401(10376):605–16.
6. Evans BR, Leighton FA. A history of One Health. Revue Scientifique et Technique de l'OIE. 2014 Aug 1;33(2):413–20.
7. Hayes PH. One Health, One Disease. The Bistoury. 1877 Oct;13(3):283–5.
8. Capua I, Cattoli G. One Health (r)Evolution: Learning from the Past to Build a New Future. Viruses. 2018 Dec 18;10(12):725.
9. Faijue DD, Segui AO, Shringarpure K, Razavi A, Hasan N, Dar O, et al. Constructing a One Health governance architecture: a systematic review and analysis of governance mechanisms for One Health. Eur J Public Health. 2024 Dec 1;34(6):1086–94.
10. Gebreyes WA, Dupouy-Camet J, Newport MJ, Oliveira CJB, Schlesinger LS, Saif YM, et al. The Global One Health Paradigm: Challenges and Opportunities for Tackling Infectious Diseases at the Human, Animal, and Environment Interface in Low-Resource Settings. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014 Nov 13;8(11):e3257.

11. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018 October 2;169(7):467–73.

12. Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI). Critical Appraisal Tools. JBI Global [Internet]. Australia: Available from: https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools » https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools. [cited 2024 dez 01].

13. Prisma. Available: https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/prisma-scr/. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews. Enhancing Quality and Transparency of Health Research (Equator) Network.

282 **Appendix. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses**
283 **extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist**

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable) the background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions related to the review questions and objectives.	1-2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Please explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed concerning their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	5
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and, if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	NA
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status) and provide a rationale.	7
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources) and the date the most recent search was executed.	7
Search	8	Present the complete electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits to prevent it from being repeated.	7
Selection of sources of evidence	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	7
Data charting process	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that the team has tested before their use and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	8
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	5
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	NA

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	7
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give the number of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	NA
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	NA
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	NA
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	NA
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results related to the review questions and objectives.	NA
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	NA
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	NA
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results concerning the review questions, objectives, and potential implications and/or next steps.	NA
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence and sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	7

Adapted from reference (11): Tricco AC, Illie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMAScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018;169:467-473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850